

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9                   AT SEATTLE

10                  ZUNUM AERO, INC.,

CASE NO. C21-0896JLR

11                  Plaintiff,

ORDER

12                  v.

13                  THE BOEING COMPANY, et al.,

14                  Defendants.

15                   **I. INTRODUCTION**

16       Before the court are two motions to seal filed by Plaintiff Zunum Aero, Inc.

17 ("Zunum") in connection with its motion to compel discovery. (9/19/23 Mot. (Dkt.

18 # 144); 10/6/23 Mot. (Dkt. # 173); *see also* MTC (Dkt. # 145) (sealed).) Defendants The

19 Boeing Company and Boeing HorizonX Ventures, LLC (collectively, "Boeing") support

20 both sealing motions. (9/19/23 Mot. Resp. (Dkt. # 170) at 1; 10/6/23 Mot. Resp. (Dkt.

21 # 183) at 1.) The court has considered the parties' submissions, the relevant portions of

22 //

the record, and the governing law. Being fully advised,<sup>1</sup> the court GRANTS in part Zunum's sealing motions.

## II. ANALYSIS

#### A. Legal Standard

“There is a strong presumption of public access to the court’s files.” Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 5(g); *see also Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003) (“In this circuit, we start with a strong presumption in favor of access to court records.”). The public’s “right of access, however, is not absolute and can be overridden given sufficiently compelling reasons for doing so.” *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1135; *see also Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978) (“[T]he right to inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute.”). To overcome the presumption of public access, a party must file a motion that includes “[a] specific statement of the applicable legal standard and the reasons for keeping a document under seal, including an explanation of” (i) “the legitimate private or public interests that warrant the relief sought”; (ii) “the injury that will result if the relief sought is not granted”; and (iii) “why a less restrictive alternative to the relief sought is not sufficient.” Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 5(g)(3)(B)(i)-(iii).

Two standards govern sealing motions in the Ninth Circuit. Ordinarily, “a party must show ‘compelling reasons’ to keep a document under seal.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1095 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Kamakana v. City &*

<sup>1</sup> Neither party requests oral argument, and the court concludes that oral argument would not be helpful to its disposition of these motions. See Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(b)(4).

1     *Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)). The Ninth Circuit has “carved  
 2 out an exception,” however, “for sealed materials attached to a discovery motion  
 3 unrelated to the merits of a case.” *Id.* at 1097 (quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1135). When  
 4 such nondispositive motions are “only tangentially related[] to the merits of a case,” “the  
 5 good cause standard from Rule 26(c)” applies. *See id.* at 1097, 1099; *see also Seattle*  
 6 *Times Co. v. Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20, 33 (1984) (“Much of the information that surfaces  
 7 during pretrial discovery may be unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying  
 8 cause of action.”).

9              District courts in this Circuit generally conclude that the good cause standard  
 10 applies to motions to compel production. *Labbe' v. Dometic Corp.*, No.  
 11 2:20-cv-01975-DAD-DMC, 2023 WL 6519306, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 4, 2023) (compiling  
 12 cases holding that the good cause standard applies to discovery motions); *see also, e.g.*,  
 13 *WhatsApp Inc. v. NSO Grp. Techs. Ltd.*, 491 F. Supp. 3d 584, 596 (N.D. Cal. 2020)  
 14 (“[P]laintiffs’ motion to compel discovery is only tangentially related to the merits and  
 15 the good cause standard applies.”); *Jasso v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No.  
 16 2:20-cv-00858-CDS-BNW, 2023 WL 4549548, at \*1 (D. Nev. June 15, 2023) (applying  
 17 “the good cause standard in evaluating whether to seal documents attached to” the  
 18 plaintiffs’ motion to compel); *Citadel Pac. Ltd. v. Hawaiian Host LLC*, No. 22-00276  
 19 JMS-WRP, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 240726, at \*6 (D. Haw. Dec. 5, 2022) (finding a  
 20 motion to compel “only tangentially related to the merits of th[e] case”).

21              The court follows the weight of authority and applies the good cause standard to  
 22 evaluate Zunum’s motion to seal documents attached to its motion to compel. To satisfy

1 this standard, Zunum and Boeing must show that “‘good cause’ exists to protect th[e]  
 2 information from being disclosed to the public by balancing the needs for discovery  
 3 against the needs for confidentiality.” *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678  
 4 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Phillips ex. rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d  
 5 1206, 1213 (9th Cir. 2002)).

6 For the reasons explained below, the court concludes that the parties have  
 7 overcome the presumption of public access and that there is good cause for sealing the  
 8 requested documents.

9 **B. 9/29/23 Motion to Seal**

10 Zunum filed 17 exhibits under seal alongside its motion to compel discovery. (See  
 11 generally 9/19/23 Danner Decl. (Dkt. # 146). See *id.* ¶ 7, Ex. 3 (Dkt. # 147) (sealed); *id.*  
 12 ¶ 9, Ex. 4 (Dkt. # 148) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 12, Ex. 6 (Dkt. # 149) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 14, Ex. 7 (Dkt.  
 13 # 150) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 16, Ex. 8 (Dkt. # 151) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 17, Ex. 9 (Dkt. # 152) (sealed);  
 14 *id.* ¶ 21, Ex. 11 (Dkt. # 153) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 22, Ex. 12 (Dkt. # 154) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 30, Ex.  
 15 19 (Dkt. # 155) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 32, Ex. 20 (Dkt. # 156) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 36, Ex. 22 (Dkt.  
 16 # 157) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 37, Ex. 23 (Dkt. # 158) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 40, Ex. 25 (Dkt. # 159)  
 17 (sealed); *id.* ¶ 48, Ex. 29 (Dkt. # 160) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 62, Ex. 32 (Dkt. # 180) (sealed); *id.*  
 18 ¶ 63, Ex. 33 (Dkt. # 181) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 66, Ex. 36 (Dkt. # 182) (sealed).)<sup>2</sup>

19 Of these, Zunum only seeks to seal Exhibit 6. (9/19/23 Mot. at 2. See generally  
 20 Ex. 6.) Zunum filed the remaining documents under seal because Boeing designated  
 21

---

22 <sup>2</sup> Docket entries 180, 181, and 182 are corrected versions of docket entries 161, 162, and  
 163. (See generally Praecipe (Dkt. # 179).)

1 them as confidential. (See 9/19/23 Mot. at 3 (“Zunum takes no position as to whether the  
 2 exhibits Boeing designated as Confidential should be sealed.”).) Boeing seeks to  
 3 maintain Exhibits 33 and 36 “under seal in their entirety.” (9/19/23 Mot. Resp. at 1-2.)  
 4 Boeing also seeks to redact portions of Exhibits 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 19, and 32. (*Id.* at 2.) It  
 5 takes no position as to the sealing of Exhibits 6, 9, 12, 20, 22, 23, 25, 29. (*Id.*)

6         The court first considers Exhibit 6, which Zunum seeks to maintain under seal in  
 7 its entirety. (9/19/23 Mot. at 5.) Exhibit 6 “is an amended response to Boeing’s first set  
 8 of interrogatories, seeking a description of Zunum’s trade secrets.” (*Id.* at 2. *See*  
 9 *generally* Ex. 6.) The court has reviewed the document and agrees with Zunum that it  
 10 contains sensitive information concerning Zunum’s proprietary technology and business  
 11 strategies, including those detailing its software platform, powertrain system, propulsion  
 12 system, and market analytics. (9/19/23 Mot. at 5. *See generally* Ex. 6.) Zunum has  
 13 legitimate concerns that the public disclosure of this material could jeopardize its ability  
 14 to compete in the aerospace industry. (9/19/23 Mot. at 5); *see also* *Bombardier Inc. v.*  
 15 *Mitsubishi Aircraft Corp.*, No. C18-1543JLR, 2019 WL 858777, at \*3 (W.D. Wash. Feb.  
 16 22, 2019) (keeping Bombardier’s “confidential and proprietary trade secret information”  
 17 under seal due to the risk of “significant harm, which outweighs the policies favoring  
 18 disclosure”). Zunum seeks to maintain Exhibit 6 entirely under seal because the whole  
 19 document contains in-depth descriptions of trade secrets, and the court agrees that  
 20 attempting to redact this exhibit is not practical. (See 9/19/23 Mot. at 5.) Accordingly,  
 21 there is good cause to keep Exhibit 6 under seal.

22 //

1       The court next considers Exhibits 33 and 36, which Boeing seeks to maintain  
2 under seal in their entirety. (*See* 9/19/23 Mot. Resp. at 1-2.) Exhibit 33 is a letter from  
3 Zunum to Boeing’s counsel that “reflects information about an internal folder structure  
4 used by Boeing for investment analysis, along with certain non-public terms and  
5 information relating to Boeing’s external investment activities.” (10/2/23 Durning Decl.  
6 (Dkt. # 171) ¶ 9. *See generally* Ex. 33.) Exhibit 36 “is an internal Boeing email chain  
7 that reflects information about an internal folder structure used by Boeing for investment  
8 analysis, along with certain non-public information and terms concerning Boeing’s  
9 external investment activities.” (10/6/23 Durning Decl. ¶ 10. *See generally* Ex. 36.)  
10 Senior counsel for Boeing declares that “[d]issemination of this information could harm  
11 Boeing’s competitive and cybersecurity position.” (10/6/23 Durning Decl. ¶¶ 9-10.) The  
12 court has reviewed the documents and concludes that there is good cause for keeping  
13 them under seal due to Boeing’s concerns about maintaining its competitive status and  
14 cybersecurity position. *See Cave Consulting Grp., Inc. v. OptumInsight, Inc.*, No.  
15 15-cv-03424-JCS, 2017 WL 11464031, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2017) (finding good  
16 cause to seal “apparent” where the exhibit contained emails discussing “business  
17 strategies, including sales/marketing strategies, competitive strategies, and internal  
18 discussions of the methodologies of [the company’s] products”); *Cage v. Boshaw*, No.  
19 C20-1063RSL-MLP, 2020 WL 6158824, at \*2 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 21, 2020) (finding the  
20 good cause standard met where the defendants “detailed legitimate security concerns  
21 relating to the” materials). Due to the substantial amount of sensitive information  
22 contained in Exhibits 33 and 36, they will remain under seal.

1 Boeing also seeks to partially redact Exhibits 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 19, and 32. (9/19/23  
2 Mot. Resp. at 2; *see also* 10/2/23 Durning Decl. (Dkt. # 171) ¶ 2, Ex. 3 (redacted); *id.* ¶ 3,  
3 Ex. 4 (redacted); *id.* ¶ 4, Ex. 7 (redacted); *id.* ¶ 5, Ex. 8 (redacted); *id.* ¶ 6, Ex. 11  
4 (redacted); *id.* ¶ 7, Ex. 19 (redacted); *id.* ¶ 8. Ex. 32 (redacted).) Boeing argues that  
5 “Exhibits 3, 7, 8, 11, and 19 reflect the state of Boeing’s understanding of alternative  
6 aircraft propulsion and hybrid-electric aircraft technologies” and that “[d]issemination of  
7 this information would reveal certain aspects of Boeing’s approach to aircraft design and  
8 development, and could harm Boeing’s competitive position.” (9/19/23 Mot. Resp. at 3;  
9 *see also* 10/2/23 Durning Decl. ¶¶ 2, 4-7.) In addition, Exhibits 4, 7, and 32 “contain  
10 confidential information about Boeing’s internal file structure.” (9/19/23 Mot. Resp. at 3;  
11 *see also* 10/2/23 Durning Decl. ¶¶ 3-4, 8.) Boeing states that “revealing this information  
12 could make Boeing’s internal information systems more vulnerable to cyber-attacks.”  
13 (9/19/23 Mot. Resp. at 3; *see also* 10/2/23 Durning Decl. ¶¶ 3, 8.) The court has  
14 reviewed the documents and concludes that there is good cause to seal the sensitive  
15 excerpts in these exhibits due to the risk of harm to Boeing’s competitive status and  
16 cybersecurity position. Boeing’s proposed redactions attached to Mr. Durning’s October  
17 2, 2023 declaration are also reasonably tailored to cover just Boeing’s confidential  
18 information.

19 Finally, the court turns to Exhibits 9, 12, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 29. Neither party  
20 takes a position on whether these documents should be sealed. The court therefore  
21 DIRECTS the Clerk to unseal Exhibits 9 (Dkt. # 152), 12 (Dkt. # 154), 20 (Dkt. # 156),  
22 //

1 | 22 (Dkt. # 157), 23 (Dkt. # 158), 25 (Dkt. # 159), and 29 (Dkt. # 160) to Mr. Danner's  
2 | September 19, 2023 declaration.

3 |           The court ORDERS the parties to meet and confer and file a redacted copy of  
4 | Zunum's motion to compel (Dkt. # 145) consistent with the above rulings by no later than  
5 | November 6, 2023.

6 |           The court now considers Zunum's October 6, 2023 motion.

7 | **C. 10/6/23 Motion to Seal**

8 |           Zunum filed a redacted version of its reply brief in support of its motion to compel  
9 | (Reply (Dkt. # 174)) and two additional exhibits under seal on the docket (10/6/23  
10 | Danner Decl. (Dkt. # 175) ¶ 3, Ex. 37 (Dkt. # 177) (sealed); *id.* ¶ 4, Ex. 38 (Dkt. # 178)  
11 | (sealed).) Zunum takes no position as to whether these materials should be kept under  
12 | seal. (*See* 10/6/23 Mot. at 3.) Exhibit 37 is an excerpted deposition transcript of Boeing  
13 | employee Steven Shumate. (*See generally* Ex. 37.) It "contains information reflecting  
14 | the state of Boeing's understanding of alternative aircraft propulsion technologies, the  
15 | personnel or resources that Boeing committed to further that understanding, non-public  
16 | projects . . . and Boeing's business process for evaluating new potential business or  
17 | investment opportunities." (10/27/23 Durning Decl. (Dkt. # 184) ¶ 2.) Exhibit 38 "is a  
18 | March 19, 2018 HorizonX Catalyst Valuation slide deck" that "reflects non-public terms  
19 | and information relating to Boeing's external investment activities, including Boeing's  
20 | valuation of such opportunities." (*Id.* ¶ 3. *See generally* Ex. 38.) Senior counsel for  
21 | Boeing declares that dissemination of the information contained in Exhibits 37 and 38  
22 | "could harm Boeing's competitive position." (10/27/23 Durning Decl. ¶¶ 2-3.)

Having reviewed the exhibits, the court agrees with Boeing that the information within them is sensitive and could harm Boeing's competitive position if disseminated to the public. Although deposition transcripts can generally be redacted, *see, e.g., Scott v. Carr*, No. C20-0236RSM, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91763, at \*5 (W.D. Wash. May 13, 2021), the court finds that Exhibit 37 contains a robust discussion of sensitive Boeing business information that warrants sealing the excerpted transcript in its entirety. Similarly, nearly all of the details and data on the slides in Exhibit 38 constitute proprietary Boeing information that, if disclosed, could harm its competitive position in the aerospace industry. Good cause therefore exists to keep Exhibits 37 and 38 under seal.

Having compared the redacted and unredacted versions of Zunum's reply brief, the court further concludes that the redacted version (Dkt. # 174) is narrowly tailored to cover Boeing's confidential information without impeding the public's ability to understand the issues.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS in part Zunum's motions to seal (Dkt. ## 144, 173). The court DIRECTS the Clerk to unseal Exhibits 9 (Dkt. # 152), 12 (Dkt. # 154), 20 (Dkt. # 156), 22 (Dkt. # 157), 23 (Dkt. # 158), 25 (Dkt. # 159), and 29 (Dkt. # 160) to Mr. Danner's September 19, 2023 declaration. The court ORDERS the parties to meet and confer and file a redacted copy of Zunum's motion to compel (Dkt. # 145) consistent with the above rulings by no later than **November 6, 2023**.

//

1 Dated this 1st day of November, 2023.  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

  
JAMES L. ROBART  
United States District Judge